UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,327	09/29/2003	Peter Lang	2058.233US1	4654

50400   7590   05/12/2010
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/SAP
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
SANDERS, AARON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/12/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com
request@slwip.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/674,327	LANG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AARON SANDERS	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 February 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-12 and 14-16* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-12 and 14-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed 16 February 2010 has been entered. Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-16 are

pending. No claims are currently amended. Claims 2, 13, and 17-33 are cancelled. No claims

are new. This action is FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Falkenhainer et al., U.S. 5,930,801 ("Falkenhainer"), in view of Owens et al., U.S. 6,047,284

("Owens").

1. Falkenhainer teaches "*A computer program product, tangibly embodied in one or more*

information storage devices, for tailoring the storage of information, the computer program

product comprising instructions operable to cause one or more data processing apparatuses to,"

see Fig. 1 and col. 3, ll. 13-23, "The http server 16 communicates with what is here called a

'command utility' 18. The command utility 18 is a set of programs or subroutines, each program

corresponding to one command which influences an 'object' as defined above."

Falkenhainer teaches "*present a user with options for tailoring an object,*" see Fig. 2 and

"FIG. 2 is an example of a screen which can be presented to a user (typically, the owner or

manager of an object) when it is desired to edit the permissions of the object." Falkenhainer

does not teach that the "*object*" is an "*object class definition*." Owens, however, teaches that in

"object-oriented environments, a class defines a group of objects that share the same

characteristics," see col. 6, ll. 1-5. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the database art at the time of the invention to define a class of objects instead of a single object

because doing so would have allowed Falkenhainer's system to gain reusability of the access

information, i.e. an owner could define a class of permissions that would apply to multiple files

instead of a single one, see Owens col. 6, ll. 1-5.

Falkenhainer teaches "*the user input identifying: a first field*," see Fig. 2, Table 1, col. 6,

ll. 10-14, "Below is a table describing the 'attributes' or detailed information which may be

contained within each object retained in the object database 20," and col. 9, l. 66 – col. 10, l. 9,

"FIG. 2 is an example of a screen which can be presented to a user (typically, the owner or

manager of an object) when it is desired to edit the permissions of the object," where the claimed

"first field" is the referenced "readers" field in Table 1. Falkenhainer does not teach "*to be*

included in the tailored object class definition." Owens does, however, see Fig. 7, step 301.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the

invention to define a class of objects instead of a single object because doing so would have

allowed Falkenhainer's system to gain reusability of the access information, i.e. an owner could

define a class of permissions that would apply to multiple files instead of a single one, see

Owens col. 6, ll. 1-5.

Falkenhainer teaches "*a second field*," see Fig. 2 and Table 1, where the claimed "second

field" is the referenced "writers" field of Table 1. Falkenhainer does not teach "*to be included in*

the tailored object class definition." Owens does, however, see Fig. 7, step 301. Thus, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to

define a class of objects instead of a single object because doing so would have allowed

Falkenhainer's system to gain reusability of the access information, i.e. an owner could define a

class of permissions that would apply to multiple files instead of a single one, see Owens col. 6,

ll. 1-5.

Falkenhainer teaches "*a first user or group of users and a first identifier associated with

the first field to identify that the first user or group of user is to be excluded from a first activity

that involves the first field,*" see Fig. 2 and Table 1, where the claimed "first user" is, for

example, the referenced user "John Doe," the claimed "first identifier" is the referenced

checkbox (when unchecked), and the claimed "first activity" is the referenced reading.

Falkenhainer teaches "*and a second user or group of users and a second identifier

associated with the second field to identify that the second user or group of users is to be

excluded from a second activity that involves the second field,*" see Fig. 2, where the claimed

"second group of users" is, for example, the referenced group "Anyone," the claimed "second

identifier" is the referenced checkbox (when unchecked), and the claimed "second activity" is

the referenced writing.

Falkenhainer teaches "*tailor and store the object... to include the first field and the

second field, identifiers of the first and second users or groups of users and the first and second

identifiers and associations to their respective fields,*" see Fig. 2, Table 1, and col. 8, ll. 24-

33, "With the system of the present [method], however, the security properties of an object are

embodied in the list of 'readers' and 'writers' listed in the object itself." Falkenhainer does not

teach that the "*object*" is an "*object class definition.*" Owens, however, teaches that in "object-

oriented environments, a class defines a group of objects that share the same characteristics," see

col. 6, ll. 1-5. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the

time of the invention to define a class of objects instead of a single object because doing so

would have allowed Falkenhainer's system to gain reusability of the access information, i.e. an

owner could define a class of permissions that would apply to multiple files instead of a single

one, see Owens col. 6, ll. 1-5.

Falkenhainer does not teach "*receive user input for tailoring the object class definition in*

response to the presentation of options." Owens does, however, see Fig. 7, step 301. Thus, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention

to define a class of objects instead of a single object because doing so would have allowed

Falkenhainer's system to gain reusability of the access information, i.e. an owner could define a

class of permissions that would apply to multiple files instead of a single one, see Owens col. 6,

ll. 1-5.

Falkenhainer does not teach "*and instantiate an object from the tailored object class*

definition." Owens does, however, see col. 6, ll. 1-5, "An object is created by being instantiated

as a member of a class." Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

database art at the time of the invention to define a class of objects instead of a single object

because doing so would have allowed Falkenhainer's system to gain reusability of the access

information, i.e. an owner could define a class of permissions that would apply to multiple files

instead of a single one, see Owens col. 6, ll. 1-5. Falkenhainer teaches "*the instantiated object*

including the association of the first identifier with the first field and the association of the

second identifier with the second field, wherein during data processing activities, the instantiated object excludes the first user or group of users from the first activity and the second user or group of users from the second activity," see Table 1 and col. 8, ll. 34-44, "According to a currently-preferred embodiment… an object which describes a file, collection, or other object such as a calendar, has within its object data the 'handles' of its owner, its readers, and its writers… The readers are those users who have only read access to the file or collection; the writers are those users having write access."

3. Falkenhainer teaches "*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input identifying a role that the first user or group of users plays in an operation,*" see Fig. 2 and Table 1, where the claimed "role" is the referenced "Reader."

4. Falkenhainer teaches "*The computer program product of claim 3, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to associate an identifier of the role with the first field,*" see Table 1, where the claimed "identifier" is the referenced "readers" handle.

5. Falkenhainer teaches "*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input identifying a fieldgroup that includes the first field,*" see Table 1, where the claimed "fieldgroup" is the referenced "handle-list."

6. Falkenhainer teaches "*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to: receive first user input*

identifying the first field and the second field from a first individual," see Fig. 2, where the

claimed "first individual" is the referenced user "Brian Falkenhainer."

Falkenhainer teaches "*and receive second user input identifying the first user or group of*

users and the second user or group of users from a second individual," see Fig. 2, where the

claimed "second individual" would be the referenced user "John Doe," who, like Brian

Falkenhainer, also has manager rights.

7. Falkenhainer teaches "*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the*

instructions also cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input

identifying the first activity from which the first user or group of users is excluded," see Fig. 2

and Table 1, where the users associated with the reading activity are excluded from writing.

8. Falkenhainer teaches "*The computer program product of claim 7, wherein the*

instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input identifying

an authorization level identifying the first activity," see Fig. 2, where the claimed "authorization

level" is the referenced reading.

9. Falkenhainer teaches "*The computer program product of claim 8, wherein the*

instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input selecting

the authorization level from a group of at least four authorization levels," see Fig. 2, where the

claimed "four authorization levels" are the referenced reading, writing, managing, and none,

which is indicated by "Remove From Access List."

10. Falkenhainer teaches "*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the*

instructions also cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to: identify a trigger; and

based upon the identification of the trigger, end the association of the first identifier with the first

field to indicate that the first user or group of users is no longer excluded from the first activity,"
see Fig. 2, where the claimed "trigger" is the user changing which boxes are checked.

11. Falkenhainer teaches *"The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the
instructions also cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to: receive user input
identifying an operation performed with the tailored object,"* see Fig. 2, where the claimed
"operation" is the referenced reading.

Falkenhainer teaches *"and associate an operation identifier, the first identifier, and the
first field to indicate that the first user or group of users is to be excluded from the first activity
that involves the first field in the operation,"* see Fig. 2 and Table 1, where the users associated
with the reading activity are excluded from writing.

12. Falkenhainer teaches *"The computer program product of claim 11, wherein the
instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input identifying
a collaboration of at least two parties,"* see Fig. 2 and Table 1, where the claimed
"collaboration" is the referenced user group(s).

14. Falkenhainer teaches *"The computer program product of claim 1, wherein: the first
activity comprises display of contents of the first field; and the second activity comprises display
of contents of the second field,"* see col. 7, ll. 42-58, "When a command regarding the properties
is submitted by a user to command utility 18, the command utility 18 displays the data within the
object in a usable form on the screen of the user."

15. Falkenhainer teaches *"The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the
instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to create a graphical user
interface to lead a user through the tailoring,"* see Fig. 2.

16. Falkenhainer teaches "*The computer program product of claim 15, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to create the graphical user interface on a web browser,*" see Fig. 2 and col. 11, ll. 40-51, "Use of any programming language through the CGI, or any web server specific interface, enable the commands to be embedded in a web server such as http server 16."

Response to Arguments

As per applicant's argument that Falkenhainer does not teach "user input identifying: a first field… [and] a second field," the examiner respectfully disagrees. Falkenhainer teaches that each file in a plurality of files has an associated data object that controls read/write access to the file (see Abstract). Each data object includes a number of attributes, including "readers" and "writers" attributes, which specify the users who can read or write to the file (see Table 1 and col. 6, ll. 10-14). A user can customize the read and write access to a file by changing the values stored in the data object by selecting checkboxes as shown in Fig. 2. Thus, the user customizes the data object, and each data object may contain both read and write attributes.

Falkenhainer's customizable data objects, when combined with Owens, correspond to applicant's tailored object class definitions. Each data object may include two relevant attributes (i.e. "fields"), a "readers" field and a "writers" field. These attributes/fields correspond to the Reader and Writer columns in Fig. 2. Thus, Falkenhainer teaches "a first field… [and] a second field." Falkenhainer does not explicitly teach that user input identifies the fields, but Owens does, as shown above with respect to the "receive user input" limitation. Even so, Falkenhainer implies that user input would identify these fields, as each attribute/field listed in Table 1 "may

be contained" in each object (col. 6, ll. 10-14). That implies that at some point, a user identifies

which fields should be contained in the custom object.

As per applicant's argument that Falkenhainer does not teach "a first (second) user or

group of users and a first (second) identifier associated with the first (second) field to identify

that the first (second) user or group of user is to be excluded from a first (second) activity that

involves the first (second) field," the examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, each

object contains at least two fields/attributes, a readers field and a writers field. The readers and

writers fields contain a list of user identifiers (i.e. "handles") that indicate which user may read

or write to the underlying file. Looking at Fig. 2, then, the claimed "user[s]" are the referenced

users "John Doe" and "Anyone," the claimed "identifier[s]" are the referenced checkboxes, and

the claimed "activit[ies]" are the referenced reading and writing. The checkbox is the claimed

"identifier" because it is "associated with" the first (second) field and, when unchecked,

"identifies" that the user "is to be excluded from a first (second) activity." The activities

"involve" the first (second) field in that the readers and writers fields specify who can perform

that activity.

Applicant has argued for one interpretation of the claims. The examiner, however, must

give the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation. Here, the term "field" is not limited to

applicant's definition, and can include an attribute or attribute values of a table. In fact, the

specification recites such a description of "field" at p. 1, ll. 10-12. Further, the phrase "excluded

from a first (second) activity that <u>involves</u> the first (second) field" is very broad. It does not

require permissions data to be specified at a field level of a data object, as applicant asserts.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection in view of Falkenhainer and Owens is maintained, and this action is made FINAL.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Sanders whose telephone number is 571-270-1016. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00a-4:00p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tim T. Vo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2168

/Aaron Sanders/
Examiner, Art Unit 2168
29 April 2010